OPINION 2178 (Case 3346)

Misumena nepenthicola (currently *Henriksenia nepenthicola*; Arachnida, Araneae, THOMISIDAE): proposed attribution of authorship to Pocock (1898) not approved

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that the proposed attribution of authorship of the nepenthicolous thomisid spider *Misumena nepenthicola* to Pocock (1898) is not approved. The name *M. nepenthicola* (currently *Henriksenia nepenthicola*) is commonly but incorrectly attributed to Pocock, and is threatened by the available but not widely used name *Misumenops nepenthicola* Bristowe, 1930 and by its primary homonym *Misumenops nepenthicola* Fage, 1928, used for a different spider species from Singapore.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Arachnida; Araneae; MISUMENINI; *Misumena*; *Misumenops*; *Henriksenia*; *Henriksenia nepenthicola*; Borneo; Singapore; crab spiders; *Nepenthes* pitchers.

Ruling

(1) It is hereby ruled that the proposed attribution of the name *Misumena nepenthicola* to Pocock (1898) is not approved.

(2) No names are placed on the Official Lists or Indexes in this ruling.

History of Case 3346

An application to attribute the name *Misumena nepenthicola* to Pocock (1898) was received from Pekka T. Lehtinen (*Centre for Biodiversity, University of Turku, Turku, FIN-20014, Finland*) on 15 April 2005. After correspondence the case was published in BZN **63**: 102–105 (June 2006). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. No comments on this case were received.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 March 2007 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN **63**: 103. At the close of the voting period on 1 June 2007 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 10: Fautin, Grygier, Macpherson, Mahnert, Mawatari, Ng, Papp, Patterson, Pyle and Song.

Negative votes – 16: Alonso-Zarazaga, Bogutskaya, Bouchet, Brothers, Halliday, Kerzhner, Kottelat, Krell, Kullander, Lamas, Lim, Minelli, Pape, Rosenberg, Štys and van Tol.

Zhang abstained.

Commissioners voting against considered that the implications of approval of the proposal were unclear, and that the application was premature.

No names were placed on the Official Lists or Indexes.